DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 687 EA 024 138

AUTHOR Aitken, H. Peter
TITLE Leadership, Learning, and Renewal: A Study of the Attitudes and Opinions Expressed by Independent School Heads Concerning Their Own Professional Development.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Board Administrator Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; Leadership Training; *Principals; *Private Schools; *Professional Development; School Based Management

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study of independent school heads' needs for and attitudes toward professional development are presented in this paper, with a focus on contextual problems and perceptions of management and leadership. A survey mailed to all 988 member schools of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) in 1989 elicited 500 responses. Telephone interviews were conducted with a small subsample of survey respondents. Findings indicate that school heads identified the promotion of instructional climate and values as their preeminent leadership role, yet they assigned a medium priority rank to curriculum development. They viewed student discipline, teacher evaluation, and financial duties as managerial tasks with limited scopes of leadership. Tensions expressed in regard to management and leadership suggest that: (1) independent schools may be "overmanaged and underled"; and (2) regular assessment of the administrator-board relationship is important. A recommendation is that professional development programs should address these issues. (32 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. P. Aitken

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED347687

Leadership, Learning, and Renewal:

A Study of the Attitudes and Opinions Expressed by Independent School Heads Concerning Their Own Professional Development

H. Peter Aitken

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association

San Francisco

April 20-24, 1992

EA 024 138

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Leadership, Learning, and Renewal:
A Study of the Needs and Attitudes Expressed by Independent School Heads
Concerning Their Own Professional Development

The Problem and the Project

Imagine that, carried away by its enthusiasm for the merits of school based management, the school board of Chicago (or Dade County, or Philadelphia) were to dissolve itself and grant complete autonomy to each school. Further, imagine that Goodlad's (1984; 326-339) advocacy of small school size falls on receptive ears so that soon the three hundred and sixty thousand children in the district are attending a thousand different schools, each with separate buildings comprising its own campus, each with its own school board, principal, administration, teachers, policies, programs, curriculum, and financial structure. Finally, imagine that some calamity forces evacuation of the city resulting in relocation of the schools throughout the United States and several foreign countries. If the school reform movement has helped us to recognize the principal as the key to school improvement, even within the existing organizational structure of the characteristic large school system, then we will understand why the principals of Chicago's (or Dade County's, or Philadelphia's) thousand scattered schools, each now completely responsible for its own destiny in the absence of any collective, organizational structure, will have to be extraordinary people if the schools are to flourish and the children to be well educated.

The analogy can't be pushed very far, but it may help to suggest why the issue of leadership development in independent schools is central to the vitality of the schools and to the quality of the education they offer. For a thousand independent schools across the country, each with its own governing board, head of school, administration, faculty, students, educational program, plant, assets, and liabilities, place extraordinary demands on the men and women who head them. And it may also be helpful to locate the case for the study of educational leadership issues reported here in a broader context.

Importance of the Topic

A renewed understanding of the challenges encountered in heading an independent school and of the professional development needs of independent school leaders is important for at least four reasons.

First, the school reform movement and the effective schools literature have pointed to the role of the principal and to site-based management as keys to improving public schools. The independent school head has traditionally been recognized as exerting a dominant influence on school quality and independent schools epitomize site-based management.

With an appropriate caveat about the limited transferability of experience from independent to public schools, it makes sense to suggest that an understanding of the exercise of leadership and the context of management in independent schools may yield insights that can contribute to public school reform and improvement.

Second, arguing that "school reform has been restricted to the domain of policy, leaving the institutions of educational governance unchanged (and that these institutions are) fundamental causes of the very problems they are supposed to be solving," Chubb and Moe (1990; 18) propose radical restructuring of public elementary and secondary education in order that public schools may reap the benefits of competition in the market-place and of institutional autonomy - advantages to which they (Chubb and Moe) attribute the comparative strength of the private school sector. Again, the implication is that aspects of the private school model may have the potential to suggest ways of improving public schools.

Third, leadership itself is a perennial concern for Americans - not just educational leadership but corporate, business, and political leadership (Katz, 1974; Burns, 1978; Bennis, 1989; Zaleznik, 1989; Gardner, 1990). One fundamental concern is the declining international competitiveness of the American economy and it was to this problem that *A Nation At Risk* explicitly linked the imperative for educational reform. Now, Katz (1974) emphasizes the importance of conceptual thinking in effective administrative leaders but suggests that the relevant skills may not be significantly developed much beyond adolescence. On the other hand, Gardner (1988; 25) is convinced that "most of what goes into leadership is learned," and stresses that a central task of leadership is renewal. So, if education has a part to play in revitalizing the nation's economy, if adolescence is a prime time for the development of conceptual skills, and if school leaders foster climates favorable to renewal by their own eagerness to learn and grow, then related educational, political, and economic objectives will all be served by a better understanding of the problems of school leadership and of the ways in which school leaders attend to their own professional development in their efforts to overcome these problems.

Fourth, the preparation, training, and development of independent school heads are less formal, less visible, and less well understood processes than they are for public school principals. In the independent school world, there are no formal equivalents to principals' and superintendents' certification and in-service requirements. The independence of independent schools, their geographic dispersion, and the small size of the entire sector are factors contributing to an almost total lack of literature on the

professional development of independent school leaders. The study reported here therefore beaks new ground.

The 1989 Survey of NAIS School Heads

When I joined NAIS in 1988, the association's professional development programs for school heads were urgently in need of overhaul and revitalization. First, a week-long summer workshop offered annually for newly appointed school heads since the late 1960s had been led for ten years by the same director. There were increasingly serious problems associated with program content and format, with a cult of personality, and with conflict of interest. Second, a longer summer institute for experienced heads that had been very successful for 13 years from 1973 through 1985 had suffered a rapid decline in enrollment in 1986 and 1987 and had been discontinued thereafter. My administrative task was therefore two-fold. I was to appoint new leadership and faculty for the new heads workshop and coordinate the development of a new program. And I was to reconceive entirely the approach to be taken by NAIS to professional development for more experienced school heads. The background I brought to this task spanned nearly 30 years in teaching and administration in three independent schools in two countries, including 13 years as a school head, and active participation in NAIS professional development programs. To complement the specific insights derived from these individual experiences, I felt it important that I should learn as much as I could, in preparation for my task, about the current state of the independent school headship and about the perspectives of independent school heads on their own professional growth and development.

In 1989, I undertook a study in order to learn how independent school heads themselves reflect on the rewards and difficulties of their jobs, how they think of their roles in terms of management and leadership, and in what ways they look to professional development activities to enhance their capabilities or contribute to the solution of their problems. This paper reports on aspects of that study related to contextual problems and to perceptions of management and leadership.

Conceptual Framework

The problems encountered by independent school heads, and therefore their professional development needs are related to (a) deficiencies in preparation, (b) contextual factors, and (c) ways in which heads think about management and leadership. While the in-service movement for public school principals yields insights that have some applicability in the independent school context, there are limits to their transferability that are related to differences in scope for management and leadership in the jobs of principal and head.

Literature

Preparation and Training

Wimpelberg (1990) has written a useful review of the literature about principals' in-service programs. His primary sources were special issues of the NASSP Bulletin (1987) and Theory Into Practice (Daresh, 1986); Murphy and Hallinger's (1987) Approaches to Administrative Training in Education; and two volumes of Reflections (Scott-McDonald, 1986, and Hagstrom, 1987) published by the National Network of Principals' Centers. Among the points Wimpelberg makes are the following.

The school reform and school effectiveness movements have increasingly viewed the principal as the key to school improvement. Factors which have contributed to the growth of the in-service movement include principals' desire for recognition based on self-improvement, their active interest in learning for its own sake, and their preference for in-service over pre-service forms of training for a wide range of job-related competencies.

"Repeated surveys by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) confirm that principals and superintendents believe their preparation was seriously deficient. This view has led to a growing conviction that practitioners must play a larger role in defining professional standards and in designing preparation programs that reflect those standards" (Thompson, 1989; 372). Wimpelberg (op. cit.; 106) points out that "there is a nascent ideology that ... principals should be in charge of their own professional development." Barth (1980; 204) supports this view. And Murphy and Hallinger (1987) observe that the new in-service training models, accentuating "the increased involvement of principals in planning, implementing, and evaluating their inservice experiences," are designed around "principles of adult learning, effective teaching and staff development, and institutional change."

Wimpelberg (op. cit.; 96) reports that "one of the more novel subjects in principals in-service this decade (i.e. the 1980s) has been the images of leadership in the humanities," while conceptual frameworks underlying choices of content and activity by a number of in-service providers have also included those in *The One Minute Manager* (Blanchard and Johnson, 1982) and *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations* (Bolman and Deal, 1984). These themes in the in-service movement suggest the importance of reflecting on the principalship or headship in terms of leadership and

management, and of understanding how principals and heads themselves perceive their roles.

Levine (1989) sees a connection between principals' own developmental maturity and their effectiveness in encouraging growth in others. She raises a profound question about the ways in which schools and school systems may thwart the growth of adults, especially those at more advanced developmental stages. For both these reasons, she emphasizes the importance of social interaction, and particularly peer interaction, in the developmental process. She offers a conceptual framework for thinking about the professional development of school leaders in terms of adult development.

There may be differences between the chronologies of *adult* development and *professional* development. One would expect *adult* developmental factors influencing principals' in-service needs to be related to *age*, and *professional* development needs to show a clearer connection with *length of service* on the job. One objective of the study reported here is to explore ways in which school heads' perspectives on professional development differ with age and professional experience.

In her study of assessments of professional development experiences by successful, Massachusetts principals, Cooper (1988; 91) found that "(the female) gender, years of experience as a principal, and the amount of formal education are positively related to being identified as a "successful" principal." While I have not attempted to deal with Cooper's concept of the "successful principal," I have assumed that gender and length of experience in the job may influence school heads' reports of the challenges they face and their assessments of the relative importance of different professional development activities.

Contextual Issues

The in-service literature treats programs extensively but attends less to principals' own perspectives on the problems, difficulties, and frustrations of their jobs. Duke studied four principals who were considering quitting their jobs. The four were bright, capable, accomplished people, all with doctorates from distinguished universities. "Involved in professional activities outside their schools, including consulting, writing for publication, and teaching in graduate programs," they were "generally regarded as among the finest and most effective school leaders in the region" (Duke, 1988; 309-310). Duke found that these principals identified the following concerns in explaining their frustration with their jobs: "policy and administration, lack of achievement, sacrifices in personal life, lack of growth opportunities, lack of recognition and too little responsibility ... relations

with subordinates ... (and) concerns about the job itself: the challenge of doing all the things that principals are expected to do, the mundane or boring nature of much of the work, the withering array of personal interactions, the politics of dealing with various constituencies, and the tendency for managerial concerns to supersede leadership functions" (idem). Most of these issues seem related to characteristics of the job rather than to inadequacies felt by the principals and attributed to their lack of preparation. They had a ring of truth for me as I reflected on my own 13 years as a school head. For this reason, my inquiry into conditions in the current independent school headship and into heads' perceptions of their professional development needs included an attempt to identify these contextual factors.

Management and Leadership

A review of the literature suggests three contrasting perspectives on management and leadership. The first proposes clear distinctions between the functions of management and those of leadership and between the kinds of people who are good at each, while generally acknowledging that skills in either area are developable. Representative of this perspective are Burns' (1978) category of "transformational leadership," Giamatti (1988), Bennis (1989), Zaleznik (1989), and Gardner (1990). Gardner sees the distinguishing qualities of leadership as the capacities to think long-term beyond the current horizon; to see relationships to realities outside the immediate organizational environment; to reach and influence people across organizational boundaries; to understand intangibles - vision, values, motivation - and the non-rational, unconscious aspects of leader-constituent interaction; to respond politically to multiple constituencies; and to think in terms of organizational renewal and change.

Zaleznik (1989) and Bennis (1989) depict most sharply the distinctions between management and leadership as functions and between the kinds of people who are good at one or the other. Zaleznik feels passionately that what he calls the "managerial mystique" has subverted leadership capacity. Bennis' five-year study of "ninety of the most effective, successful leaders in the nation" led him to conclude that "American organizations ... are under-led and over-managed" (op. cit.; 18). Using almost identical language, Kotter (1990; 103) asserts that "most U.S. corporations today are overmanaged and underled."

A second perspective downplays the distinction, emphasizing instead the complementary relationship between leadership and management and the importance of their distribution throughout effective organizations. Burns' (1978) description of "transactional leadership" as involving a bargain between individuals each motivated by

self-interest is consistent with the political and human resource frames in which Bolman and Deal (1984) view management. Grounding his theory of leadership in the moral development work of Adler, Maslow, Piaget, Erikson, Rokeach, Kohlberg, and others, Burns puts emphasis on the reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers, associates leadership with change, and recognizes that leadership is dispersed among many individuals throughout organizations. Kotter (1990) suggests that "management is about coping with complexity ... leadership, by contrast, is about coping with change." Kotter sees leadership and management capabilities as distributed throughout organizations. He points out that well-led organizations place a premium on the development of promising leaders and suggests that "institutionalizing a leadership-centered culture is the ultimate act of leadership" (1990; 111).

A third perspective is offered by Krantz and Gilmore (1990). Arguing that "responding effectively to current conditions requires linking what has come to be viewed as leadership, the visionary and mission setting aspects of executive action, with management, the apparatuses and tools for achieving organizational purposes" (op. cit.; 183), they suggest that the lionization of a heroic conception of leadership and the denigration of "managerialism" are social defenses against complexity and change. "Managerialism (is) the magical investment in technique and method ... (h)eroic leadership, the magical hope for a savior from fossilized organizations. We believe both represent a societal level defense against the anxieties inherent in realizing the need for a deep restructuring of contemporary organizations in the face of emerging post-industrial society and in confronting the different world in which we live" (op. cit.; 202).

The Principalship and The Headship

The literature has little to offer about leadership specifically in the context of education. As Bradley (1990) observed in reporting on a recent E.C.S. study, "State Policy and the School Principal," "researchers have found a virtually silent stance on the principalship, even though principals have been given oversight responsibility for a broad array of state mandates and serve, in the researcher's words, as the fundamental accountability agents for most school systems." Leadership just makes it onto a list of nine abilities that comprise the foundation of NASSP's assessment model, developed in the mid 1970s and still widely in use in the late 1980s. But, grouped together with "sensitivity" and "stress tolerance" in a category called "inter-personal skills" (the other two categories are "administrative" and "communications") leadership is conspicuous by the extent to which NASSP underestimates its scope and importance. And, just as the scope for leadership by public school principals is as yet under-acknowledged, despite the reform rhetoric, the conception of principals as middle managers persists.

At best, principals are described as "instructional leaders," at worst "building managers!" Lortie (1975) recognized the circumscribed domain of the principalship. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980; 46) observed that "school principals are, for the most part, managers; their work environment gives most of them little choice in this matter." In the recent, seven state study of educational policy, "State Policy and the School Principal," "principals were (still) viewed generally as "middle managers" whose jobs consist of supervising the physical plant and personnel operations" (Bradley, 1990). Chubb and Moe (1990; 56) make a similar assessment. "It may be better to think of the public school principal as a lower level manager than as a leader ... The real leaders of the public school are the authorities, not the principal."

By contrast, the conception underlying NAIS' approach to professional development sees the independent school head as intellectual leader of an academic institution, managerial leader of a complex business enterprise, and personal leader of a dynamic human community. Of course there is no guarantee that practitioners meet the lofty expectations of such a job description. But the point is that the scope of the role is envisaged broadly. In practice, two constraints similar to those felt by public school superintendents and principals operate on the independent school head. First, independent school heads must look two ways, being responsible for the leadership of the faculty and at the same time accountable to a board of trustees. Second, there is evidence in public schools of a strong culture of teacher expectations favoring behavior by principals that emphasizes loyalty, orderliness, service, and the status quo rather than leadership and change (Barth, 1980; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Crow, 1990; Hurley, 1990). Although independent schools are not explicitly included in these assessments, my experience suggests that they are not immune from similar effects.

This brief discussion of management and leadership in the contexts of the principalship and the headship cannot do full justice to the complexity of the issue. And it overstates the difference between the two roles. Many public school principals shape their jobs in such a way that they exert significant leadership, just as many independent school heads allow themselves to become mired in managerial minutiae.

Research Questions

In the remainder of this paper, I report on findings related to the following research questions dealing with contextual problems of the headship and with heads' conceptions of management and leadership. Specifically, the research questions are:

In what aspects of their jobs do heads encounter problems and difficulties different from those they trace to a lack of preparation?

How do school heads view a variety of their tasks and activities in terms of the management/leadership distinction?

How are responses to selected questions about topics and emphases heads consider important in professional development programs related to respondents' gender, age, length of experience, and school size?

Research Design

The research design had two components in addition to a review of relevant literature and of NAIS records pertaining to professional development programs for school heads. The central element was a self-administered mail survey (questionnaire) sent to the heads of all 988 NAIS member schools in 1989. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted with a small sub-sample of survey respondents.

The questionnaire included both attitude and opinion questions and questions about respondents' actual behavior (Labaw, 1980). It used an inverted funnel-sequence and offered limited opportunities for open-ended responses (Sudman and Bradburn, 1982). A seven point scale was used for responses to forced, closed-ended, attitude and opinion questions (Weissberg and Bowen, 1976; 50).

Survey Response Rate and Sample Composition

Five hundred usable responses were received. The distribution of schools represented in the response sample closely mirrored the distribution in the entire NAIS membership with regard to school type (boarding, day), enrollment type (boys, girls, coeducational), grade range (elementary, secondary, K-12, etc.), school size (enrollment), and geographic region.

The median age of the heads in the response sample is 48 years, and the median length of service in their current positions is 6 years. Including previous appointments as school heads, the median length of service is 9 years.

One fifth of the respondents are women.

Summary of Findings

Management demands on independent school heads thwart the fulfillment of their leadership aspirations. Like other American organizations, independent schools may be more managed than led. Heads wish they could reshape their jobs in ways that offer more scope for leadership. They suspect that their trustees do not fully share this desire. Heads believe that one of their most significant leadership opportunities lies in promoting institutional climate and values. They view curriculum development, student discipline, faculty evaluation, and financial responsibilities as management tasks offering little scope for leadership. With lengthening experience, heads tend to relinquish an earlier protagonist stance in school affairs in favor of a perspective emphasizing commitments to the pastoral, governance, and symbolic opportunities of leadership. Heads' perspectives on management, leadership, professional development, and the rewards and challenges of their jobs are differentiated more by age and experience than by gender and school size.

The high degree of congruence among heads' responses to the questionnaire suggests a homogeneous and ingrown profession.

Contextual Problems

From a list of 26 aspects of the head's job, the following offer the greatest contextual problems: fund-raising, salary and benefit administration, evaluating the performance of teachers and administrators, conflict management, faculty supervision and development, and budget and financial management.

The mean rankings of women's scores for long range planning (7th) and public and community relations (11th) suggest that they find these aspects of their work relatively more difficult than men do. Men's mean response scores for these items yield rankings of 13th and 16th respectively. On the other hand, men, whose mean scores for curriculum development ranked it 9th, appear to have relatively more difficulty with this activity than women, for whom it ranked 13th.

For the oldest heads, (top quartile - age over 55), mean response scores on conflict management, contributing to the solution of broad educational problems, counseling faculty, and writing ranked these aspects of their work higher in the list of contextual problems than for the youngest heads (bottom quartile - age under 45). By contrast, the youngest heads' mean scores for working with trustees ranked this activity as relatively more problematic than it is for the oldest heads.

The least experienced heads (bottom quartile - 1 to 5 years experience) identify working with trustees and with other volunteers and policy development as higher ranking contextual difficulties than they are for the most experienced heads (top quartile - over 15 years experience). The mean response scores of the most experienced heads for curriculum development, instructional leadership, and counseling faculty put these roles significantly higher in the list of contextual problems for them than they are for the least experienced heads.

Admission and recruiting stands out as a higher ranking problem for the heads of the smallest schools (bottom quartile - enrollments under 211) than for those of the largest schools (top quartile - enrollments over 565).

Management and Leadership

From a list of 26 activities, "promoting institutional climate and values" consistently emerged as the role most strongly identified with leadership in analyses of heads' responses by gender, age, experience, and school size.

Most heads see finance, budget, salary and benefit administration as management functions offering limited scope for leadership. Also identified as strongly managerial activities were student discipline and the evaluation of faculty and administrators.

Asked to think back over a year and reflect on how they had spent their time, heads characterized their jobs as close to an equal mix of management and leadership. Invited to assume that they could effect some realistic changes in their job descriptions and working styles, bearing in mind their schools' mission statements, governance structures, and financial resources, heads were then asked what mix of management and leadership they would like to achieve. Most expressed a desire for their jobs to offer more scope for leadership than they currently do. This effect was somewhat more pronounced for women than for men.

Heads believe that their trustees share the desire for a balance, in the head's job, reflecting more scope for leadership. They suspect, however, that trustees would not be comfortable with as marked a shift from management toward leadership as the heads themselves favor.

Congruence of Responses

95% confidence intervals for mean response scores are used in conjunction with a measure of the sensitivity of ranking to mean response score to identify differences,

significant at the 5% level, between rankings of responses to attitude and opinion questions. In 572 item analyses, significant differences attributable to gender, age, experience, or school size, are found in just 68, or 12%, of cases.

Discussion

That heads identify "promoting institutional climate and values" as their preeminent leadership role while ranking curriculum development only in the middle of a list of 26 activities appears, initially, paradoxical. Where better, one might ask, to inculcate values than through pedagogy (how people work with each other in the context of teaching and learning) and curriculum (the choice of subject matter)? But the mission statements of most independent schools indicate that academic development, while a top priority, is but one of several equally important educational goals. Others are the development of character, citizenship, and individual potential. School heads may feel that the formal academic curriculum and the quality of teaching are in stronger condition than the informal climate so influential in the formation of values we associate with citizenship and with the realization of individual potential. Sensitive to issues of "turf" and "academic freedom," heads may also defer to administrators and teachers whose professional expertise lies primarily in the academic area. If so, this might explain the apparent paradox of the evident commitment of school heads to promoting institutional climate and values, on the one hand, and their comparatively more limited involvement in curriculum development, on the other.

That heads should regard student discipline and the evaluation of teachers and administrators as managerial tasks offering limited scope for leadership is puzzling. What better contexts could there be for a head to engage with children or adults over issues of behavior or performance related to values promoted by the school? I know no school head who claims to enjoy his or her role in student discipline, but that is not the issue. The issue is leadership and it is surprising that heads appear to underestimate the scope for their symbolic and advocacy roles with regard to espoused standards of behavior. Their designation of student discipline as a managerial function appears more self-serving than idealistic. Moreover, when the business of a school with regard to standards of behavior is perceived to be handled as a management function, students may fail to make the all-important connection between behavior and values.

With regard to staff evaluation, Barth (1980; 103-104) cites conflicts of role, purpose, and expectation in concluding that "formal evaluation has only a limited influence on staff development." And Goodlad, stressing the importance of trust between principal and teachers as a distinguishing feature of schools that are good at changing, improving, and

renewing themselves, sees a fundamental conflict between the present administrative and evaluative roles of principals. "What are the chances of establishing a bond of trust between the principal and the teachers if the principal is to be both evaluator and judge of these teachers? Very little, I fear ... The only models of evaluating teaching that have proved reasonably effective to date are those of peer review, as used by major universities. Administrators monitor the process and act on the recommendations coming to them, but they do not conduct the reviews" (Goodlad, 1984; 303).

How can we interpret the finding that heads perceive only limited leadership opportunities in their financial responsibilities? Evidence from survey responses indicates that few heads have had formal academic training or professional development experiences in quantitative, analytical, or business-related disciplines. Furthermore, heads indicate that their financial responsibilities are their least enjoyable. Intimidated by the challenge of institutional finances, under-prepared through training or experience, and finding little pleasure in the work, a head might need rare integrity to acknowledge, nevertheless, the scope for leadership inherent in the role he or she can play in this arena. But here there are no arguments, such as those about "turf" or "academic freedom" in the case of curriculum development, to support a head's case for seeming to underestimate the potential in yet another leadership opportunity. I am concerned that the limited scope independent school heads see for their leadership in financial analysis and planning may be putting their schools at a disadvantage with regard to proactive initiatives aimed at institutional positioning three, five, or more years into the future.

The two tensions sensed by heads with regard to management and leadership (their feeling about the balance in their own jobs and their suspicion that their trustees do not share to the same extent their own desire to effect change) suggest the following inferences. First, independent schools, like other American organizations, may be "over-managed and under-led." In this connection, John Matthews, professor of business management at the Harvard Business School and director of NAIS professional development programs for school heads from 1968 to 1982, once observed that independent school heads were so busy managing that they had no time to be leaders, or even to learn how to be leaders! The second inference is that conscious assessment and regular monitoring of the working relationship between a school head and his or her trustees, especially the chair of the board of trustees, is important. Trustees assert and heads acknowledge that heads are under-prepared in some management areas for the responsibilities they assume. Misaligned or diverging expectations, between trustees and

school heads, frequently play a role in the deterioration of this key relationship. When this happens, schools often pay a price in avoidable leadership transitions.

Conclusion

Independent schools are less independent than they once were. Legal, legislative, regulatory, and financial influences inexorably increase and the management of these schools grows steadily more complex. At the same time developments such as site based management and parental choice make public schools somewhat more autonomous than hitherto. In some aspects the jobs of principal and school head are tending to converge. The characteristic of the principals' in-service movement that seems most applicable in the independent school context is the conviction that professional development programs should be designed and implemented by principals and heads themselves.

The seeming paradoxes identified with regard to curriculum development, student discipline, staff evaluation, and financial affairs suggest agenda for a continuing dialogue about the nature of leadership in independent schools and for specific treatment by professional development program providers.

The twin tensions in the area of management and leadership point to the value of a similar dialogue about school governance, to treatment of these issues in development programs for school heads and trustees, and to the need for further research into the assumptions and expectations held about and for each other by heads and trustees.

Bibliography and References

Barth, R. S. (1980). *Run School Run.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why Leaders Can't Lead.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Blanchard, K. H. and Johnson, S. (1982). *The One Minute Manager.* New York, Morrow.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1980). *The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership.* Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Bradley, A. (1990). *"Study Notes Lack of Policy Activity on Principalship."* Education Week, May 2, 1990.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, Harper and Row.

Chubb, J. E. and Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics Markets and America's Schools.* Washington, The Brookings Institution.

Cooper, L. (1988). *"The Professional Development of Principals: The Principals' Perspective."* Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

Crow, G. M. (1990). *"Conceptions of the Principalship: A Career History Perspective."* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 16-20, 1990.

Daresh, J. C. (Ed.) (1986). *"Developing Administrative Leadership."* Theory Into Practice, 25.

Duke, D. L. (1988). *"Why Principals Consider Quitting."* Phi Delta Kappan, 1988, 70, 4.

Gardner, J. W. (1988). *Leadership: An Overview.* Washington, Independent Sector.

---------- (1990). *On Leadership.* New York, The Free Press.

Giamatti, A. B. (1988). *A Free and Ordered Space.* New York, W. W. Norton.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future.* New York, McGraw-Hill.

Hagstrom, D. (Ed.) (1987). *Reflections, 1987.* Cambridge, The National Network of Principals' Centers, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Hurley, J. C. (1990). *"The Organizational Socialization of High School Principals: A Description and Analysis."* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Association, Boston, April 16-20, 1990.

Katz, R. L. (1974). *"Skills of an Effective Administrator."* Harvard Business Review, September-October 1974, 23-35.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *"What Leaders Really Do."* Harvard Business Review, May-June 1990.

Krantz, J. and Gilmore, T. N. (1990). *"The Splitting of Leadership and Management as a Social Defense."* Human Relations, 43, 2, 183-204.

Labaw, P. J. (1980). *Advanced Questionnaire Design* (third reprint 1985). Cambridge, Abt Books.

Levine, S. L. (1989). *Promoting Adult Growth in Schools: The Promise of Professional Development.* Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (1987). *Approaches to Administrative Training in Education.* Albany, State University of New York Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, Superintendent of Documents, U.S.G.P.O.

Scott-McDonald, K. (Ed.) (1986). *Reflections.* Cambridge, The National Network of Principals' Centers, Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

Sudman, S. and Bradburn, N. M. (1982). *Asking Questions.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, S. D. (1989). *"Troubled Kingdoms, Restless Natives."* Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 5 (January, 1989): 371-375.

Weissberg, H. F. and Bowen, B. D. (1977). *An Introduction to Survey Research and Data Analysis.* San Francisco, W. H. Freeman and Company.

Wimpelberg, R. K. (1990). *"The Inservice Development of Principals: A New Movement, Its Characteristics, and Future."* In Lotto, L. S. and Thurston, P. W. (Eds.), *Advances in Educational Administration*, Volume 1. Greenwich, JAI Press.

Zaleznik, A. (1989). *The Managerial Mystique: Restoring Leadership in Business.* New York, Harper and Row.